

## AMENDMENT

Appln. No. 10/016,585

Amendment dated October 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed July 26, 2004

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 12 through 19, 21 through 16, and 28 through 29 remain in this application. Claims 2 through 6, 8 through 11, 20 and 27 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

**Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

The drawings have been objected to, in particular Figure 3, as having unlabeled boxes, and the Office Action requests that "[a]ll unlabeled boxes in Figure 3 should be labeled". However, Figure 3, which schematically shows a computer with a CPU unit, a display, and a keyboard, each of which is individually labeled, with some subparts of these components being further labeled. In fact, the only "boxes that appear to not be labeled with reference numbers are the outlines of the keyboard sections (which form no significant aspect of the invention and are not claimed) and the inner edge of the frame of the display, which is also not claimed as part of the invention. Thus, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection, or in the alternative, provide in any subsequent Office Action a more particularized identification of what boxes in Figure 3 need to be labeled.

It is therefore requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

## AMENDMENT

Appln. No. 10/016,585

Amendment dated October 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed July 26, 2004

**Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action**

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected on the basis of the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,143.

Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer that is submitted to overcome the double patenting rejection of claims 12 and 13, and therefore withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

**Paragraphs 7 through 12 of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 7, 21 through 22, 24 through 25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ezekiel et al ("Ezekiel", USP 5625783).

Claims 20 and 27 through 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Fujii (USP 6204842).

Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Goldman et al (Goldman USP 5644738).

Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Matheny et al ("Matheny", USP 5517606).

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "wherein the new application or applet is launched as a result of navigating to a web page", which was previously contained in claim 20. Similarly, but not identically, claim 7 requires "wherein the applications or applets are launched as a result of navigating to a web page", which was previously contained in claim 28.

With respect to claims 20 and 28 previously presented, the Office Action states:

## AMENDMENT

Appl. No. 10/016,585

Amendment dated October 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed July 26, 2004

Regarding claims 20 and 28, Ezekiel does not teach that the new application is launched as a result of navigating a web page. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Fujii. Fujii teaches a television system that interacts with the Internet, the system comprises opening a web page window (launching new application) as a result of navigating a web page (col. 2, lines 54-65).

However, it is submitted that the statement in the Office Action does not correctly state the requirements of claims 20 and 28 (now claims 1 and 7). Specifically, claim 1 requires "wherein the new application or applet is *launched as a result of* navigating to a web page", but the rejection in the Office Action attempts to restate this requirement as "opening a web page window as a result of navigating a web page". It is submitted that this statement actually reverses the order in which actions occur in the description of Fujii, and implies a causation that does not exist. Looking to the referenced portion of Fujii, it is submitted that the disclosure of Fujii patent does not support the assertion in the Office Action. Fujii states, at col. 2, lines 54 through 65:

Once the user has finished entering text and presses a "Go To Page" button on the remote control, the system enters a web-results mode. During the web-results mode, a search manager manipulates the URL address data entered by the user in the URL address data entry area by first formatting the search text in a proper form for the specified task. In the preferred embodiment, the text is formatted in proper URL format to perform a search on the Internet. The system sends the request to the Internet and acquires an Internet data page.

It is not clear from this portion of the Fujii patent that any new application or applet is being launched *as a result of* navigating to a web page. It appears that the Fujii patent is describing *navigating to a web page* at the initiation of the user, such as formatting the request, and does not describe launching a new application or applet after or as a result of navigating to a web page. In other words, the Fujii patent appears to describe here the process of *navigating to the web page*, and is not describing the results of any such navigation to a web page, such as the required launching of a new application or applet caused by the navigation. It is noted that it is only the

## AMENDMENT

Appln. No. 10/016,585

Amendment dated October 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed July 26, 2004

last sentence in this referenced portion of the Fujii patent that actually describes the obtaining of the web page itself.

With respect to the allegedly obvious combination of the Ezekiel and Fujii patents, the rejection in the Office Action further states:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Ezekiel and Fujii before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface reconstruction method taught by Ezekiel to include opening new window as resulting of navigating a web page taught by Fujii with the motivation being to enable user to access and use information obtained from the Internet (Fujii, col 1, lines 7-13).

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to make the allegedly obvious combination, the result would not satisfy the requirements of claims 1 and 7. Furthermore, the broad statement of purpose of the Fujii patent referenced in the rejection of the Office Action does not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to make the particular combination set forth in the Office Action.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Ezekial and Fujii set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1 and 7. Further, claims 21 through 27 and 29, which depend from claims 1 and 7, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 7, 12 through 19, 21 through 16, and 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraph 13 of the Office Action**

Claims 12 through 19 have been allowed.

AMENDMENT

Appln. No. 10/016,585

Amendment dated October 24, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed July 26, 2004

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By 

Date: Oct. 24, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931